

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of Office Action**

Claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Furuwari et al. (JP 11-142841).

Claims 5, 10-12, and 16 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Shiotani et al. (JP 2001-338512).

Claim 7 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Nakano (US 2003/0053008).

Claim 8 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Matsuda et al. (US 2002/0167626).

Claim 8 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0003471).

Claim 13 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Nakano.

Claim 14 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Matsuda et al.

Claim 15 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Lee et al.

### **Summary of Amendment**

Claims 1, 2, 9-11, and 15 have been amended. New claims 17-20 have been added. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-20 are now pending for consideration on the merits.

**All Claims Comply With §102 and §103**

Claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Furuwari et al. (JP 11-142841), claims 5, 10-12, and 16 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Shiotani et al. (JP 2001-338512), claim 7 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Nakano (US 2003/0053008), claim 8 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Matsuda et al. (US 2002/0167626), claim 8 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0003471), claim 13 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Nakano, claim 14 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Matsuda et al., and claim 15 stands rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furuwari et al. and Shiotani et al. further in view of Lee et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections to the extent that these references still apply to the amended claims.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite, in part, a bottom cover having “an end portion...that wraps around the reflection sheet.” Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the prior art of record teach such a feature. Furuwari, Shiotani, and Lee all disclose back covers having an end portion that is generally L-shaped. Therefore, the end portion of these back covers do not “wrap around” the lamp reflectors. (See Furuwari: Figs. 1 and 2 showing back cover 6 with L-shaped end portion; Shiotani: Figs. 3-5 showing back cover 3 with L-shaped end portion; Matsuda: Figs. 2-5, 8A-9 showing back cover 14 with L-shaped end portion.) As to

Lee, the receptacle 1650 is not “a bottom cover” but rather a frame bracket for receiving the backlight assembly. Nakano was only cited to teach the type of materials used for a reflection plate. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art of record, whether taken individually or in combination, teaches a bottom cover having “an end portion...that wraps around the reflection sheet” as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the rejections to claims 1 and 11 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10 and 13-16 depend from their respective independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the prior art of record, whether taken individually or in combination, teaches the claimed invention recited in these claims for at least the reasons stated above. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections also be withdrawn.

#### **New Claims**

New dependent claim 17 that depends from claim 11 recites limitations deleted from claim 11. Therefore, no new matter has been added. Moreover, because claim 17 depends from now allowable claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

New independent claim 18 is directed to a backlight unit disclosed in the specification and drawings, and therefore no new matter has been added. Like claims 1 and 11, claim 18 also recites a bottom cover having “an end portion that wraps around the reflection sheet.” As discussed above, none of the prior art of record, whether taken individually or in combination, teaches such a limitation. Hence, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 18 is also allowable.

New claims 19 and 20 depend from now allowable claim 18. Hence, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 19 and 20 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: December 2, 2005

By:   
Kyle V. Choi  
Reg. No. 41,480

**Customer No.: 009626**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202.739.3000  
Facsimile: 202.739.3001